



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

VB

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/040,485 03/17/98 RADOSEVICH

J 8998/3

EXAMINER

HM22/0508

ALICE O. HARTIN
BARNES & THORNBURG
200 WEST MADISON STREET
SUITE 2610
CHICAGO IL 60610

RURKE, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1642

20

DATE MAILED:

05/08/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No.
09/040,485

Applicant(s)

Radosevich et al

Examiner
Julie E. Burke (Reeves), Ph.D.

Group Art Unit
1642



THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☒ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on 21 Apr 2000 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on 21 Apr 2000 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

- ☒ The proposed amendment(s):

- ☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- ☒ will not be entered because:
- ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
- ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
- ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: Claims improperly amended without brackets or underlining. Text does not correspond to last entered amdt filed 9/10/99 but appear to follow non-entered amdt filed 2/10/00. Please see OTHER section below.

- ☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

had the amdt been entered, 112 rej of claim 7 (para 10-12) and 112 rej of claim 9-11 (para 11) would have been withdrawn.

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
- ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
proposed amendment to claim 9 still contains improper markush group; claim 7 still not enabled for broad scope of the claim,
- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
- Claims allowed: none
- Claims objected to: none
- Claims rejected: 6-7, 9-11, 19-20 with claims 1-5, 8, 12-18 withdrawn by restriction requirement.

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

- ☒ Other Advisory action mailed 3/7/00 states that the amdt filed 2/10/00 had not been entered. Claims 11-12 as amended are lacking a verb. It is not clear what is meant by a molecule: "of" seq id no 2, for example. Claim 9 now fails to include any size limit for the fragment- could one amino acid of seq id no 9, for example, be included in another, different immunologically active molecule?

9 Burke
ADVISORY ACTION